

David
~~wherein the polycationic polymer is bonded to the absorbent gelling particles; and
wherein the absorbent gelling particles, deposited onto the carrier layer, are fixed
to the surface of the carrier layer by the glue microfibers.~~

John
~~17. (Amended) The absorbent material of claim 1, wherein the absorbent material
comprises from about 50% to about 90% of the absorbent gelling particle, from about
0.1% to about 10% of the polycationic polymer; and from about 5% to about 50% of
the carrier layer by weight.~~

Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found in original claim 17, and at page 6, lines 5-35 and page 7, lines 1-4.

REMARKS

Applicants' Agent wishes to thank the Examiner for examining the above-identified Application. Claims 1-19 and 39-41 are pending in the Application. Claims 1-19 and 39-41 have been rejected. Claims 20-38 have been cancelled with traverse due to the election of species.

This response fully addresses each and every issue raised in the Office Action dated November 15, 2000. A detailed discussion of each issue is provided in the sections which follow.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to the amendments above and assert that for the reasons listed below, the application is novel and unobvious.

I. The Examiner's 35 USC 103 Rejection

The Examiner has maintained his rejection of claims 1-19 and 39-41 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. (U.S. 5,849,405) in view of Early (U.S. 4,468,428) and Anjur et al (US 5,645,542).

The Examiner states: "Early promotes the use of microfibers because they increase the water absorbent capacity of a web (col. 4 lines 10 to 20). A person of ordinary skill in the art would therefore be motivated to utilize microdenier fibers in order to further increase the water absorbent capacity of a web. . .Applicant also argues that the instant microfibers have a "tackiness" not present in the microfibers of Early. It is the Examiner's position that this argument is not commensurate in scope with the claimed invention because said property does not appear to be positively claimed. Even if such a property were claimed it appears to the Examiner that this property would be inherent in the fibers of Wang in view of Early, because binder fibers must have some tackiness in order to function as binder fibers."

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and direct the Examiner to claims 1 and 17, as amended.